	Case 2:23-cv-03034-KJM-AC	Document 48	Filed 12/11/25	Page 1 of 2	
1					
2					
3					
4					
5					
6					
7	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT				
8	FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA				
9					
10	STANLEY BURTON,	N	o. 2:23-cv-03034 I	KJM AC	
11	Plaintiff,				
12	v.	<u>O</u>	RDER		
13	SACRAMENTO HOUSING AI REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY				
14	Defendant.	,			
15	Detendant.				
16					
17	Before the court are pro se plaintiff Stanley Burton's motion to compel expert discovery				
18	(ECF No. 45) and motion for an extension of time to complete expert discovery (ECF No. 46),				
19	each signed and filed December 8, 2025. ECF No. 45 at 6, ECF No. 46 at 2. In this case, all fact				
20	discovery was to be completed by September 17, 2025. ECF No. 33. Initial expert disclosures				
21	were due on or before November 5, 2025, and rebuttal expert disclosures were due on or before				
22	December 3, 2025. <u>Id.</u> Plaintiff's motion for an extension of time to complete expert discovery				
23	states that additional time is needed because the experts he served discovery upon have not				
24	responded to his requests. ECF No. 37 at 1-2.				
25	The court has reviewed both motions and finds that they do not warrant relief. Plaintiff				
26	seeks to compel expert testimony from professionals to whom he served by certified mail a				
27	"request for expert opinion." ECF No. 45. Plaintiff attached copies of what he sent, which read				
28	as requests for documents from third parties. See, e.g. ECF No. 45 at 13. It is clear that plaintiff				

	Case 2:23-cv-03034-KJM-AC Document 48 Filed 12/11/25 Page 2 of 2				
1	has not retained any experts, and his attempt at "expert discovery" in this matter was improperly				
2	executed such that the recipients of the requests cannot be expected to respond. Though the court				
3	is cognizant of the challenges that accompany plaintiff's pro se status, there is no good cause to				
4	re-open discovery or to compel expert discovery.				
5	Plaintiff's motion for an extension of time (ECF No. 46) is DENIED for lack of good				
6	cause and his motion to compel expert discovery (ECF No. 45) is DENIED as untimely. The				
7	parties are free to continue to engage in informal negotiations regarding discovery, but the right				
8	to seek enforcement by this court concluded no later than December 3, 2025. ECF No. 33.				
9	IT IS SO ORDERED.				
10	DATED: December 10, 2025				
11	allen Clane				
12	UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE				
13					
14					
15					
16					
17					
18					
19					
20					
21					
22					
23					
24					
25					
26					
27					
20					